

APPLICATION NO.

10/092,974

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

EXAMINER

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO.

Byung-Kyu Park 101190-00025 1468

7590 04/30/2004 ARENT FOX KINTNER PLOTKIN & KAHN, PLLC Suite 600

FILING DATE

03/08/2002

1050 Connecticut Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20036-5339

BUSHEY, CHARLES S

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1724

DATE MAILED: 04/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/092,974	PARK ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Scott Bushey	1724
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address		
Period for Reply		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>24 March 2004</u> .		
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)□ This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is		
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims		
<ul> <li>4)  Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.</li> <li>4a) Of the above claim(s) 11-13 and 15-22 is/are withdrawn from consideration.</li> <li>5)  Claim(s) 8-10 and 14 is/are allowed.</li> <li>6)  Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.</li> <li>7)  Claim(s) 10 is/are objected to.</li> <li>8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.</li> </ul>		
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.		
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.		
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	
Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)     Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/06 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Date of Informal F	ate · Patent Application (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 1724

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Objections

1. Claim 10 is objected to because of the following informalities: Although claim 10 is identified as being in its original form, such is not the case as "angle y", as now recited on line 2 of the claim should be returned to its original form of "angle  $\beta$ ". Appropriate correction is required.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 3. Claims 1-4, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Morton et al '312 (Figs. 4-6, 9, 11-14, 16, 17; col. 8, line 51 through col. 10, line 21; col. 11, line 43 through col. 12, line 9).

Applicant should note that Figure 4 of the reference clearly illustrates (at the rightmost nozzle in the figure) that the hole at the outlet end of the steam nozzle is tapered at an angle within the range as set forth by instant claim 4.

Applicant should note that a recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention, i.e., "wherein the passages can be opened/shut according to humidifying capacity", must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. In this case, the claims are apparatus

Art Unit: 1724

claims, which do not recite any structure beyond that which is taught by the applied prior art reference. Apparatus claims cannot be given patentable weight based upon a potential manner of operation, no matter how desirous that operation may be. See *In re Casey*, 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967) and *In re Otto*, 136 USPQ 458, 459 (CCPA 1963).

Also, with respect to the recitation by instant claim 1 of a "thimble-type steam injection humidifier", the recitation has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951).

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later

Art Unit: 1724

invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

6. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morton et al '312 taken together with applicant's own admission of prior art.

Figures 13 and 14 of Morton et al disclose alternative nozzle assemblies for the humidifying apparatus. The reference is however, silent as to the means for connecting the nozzle means to the humidifying tubes.

In instant claim 5, applicant speaks of the injection nozzles being provided as either "a pressed pin *type* nozzle" or "a screw *type* nozzle". The manner in which applicant has chosen to recite the kind of nozzle utilized within the instant invention, i.e., by the use of the term "type" would suggest that the nozzle types utilized by applicant were known within the art prior to applicant's invention. Accordingly, it would have been obvious for an artisan at the time of the invention, to modify the nozzle types as suggested by the Morton et al '312 reference, to that of either a pressed pin type or screw type nozzle, in view of applicant's own admission of prior art.

### Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 8-10, and 14 are allowed.

#### Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed March 24, 2004 with respect to claims 1-7 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant should note that each point of argument presented by the amendment filed March 24, 2004 which were directed to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) have been specifically addressed in the rejection statement of paragraph 3 above.

Art Unit: 1724

With respect to the arguments directed to the nozzle types of instant claim 5, the rejection must stand since it is not evident how the nozzles of the invention patentably differ from those as taught by the applied prior art. It is further emphasized that use of the term *type* following an element within an apparatus claim is typically an indication that applicant is relying upon that which is well known and established within the art to provide a distinct and enabling recitation of the invention, as least with respect to the subject claim element.

#### Conclusion

9. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Scott Bushey whose telephone number is (571) 272-1153. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 6:30AM-5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Blaine R. Copenheaver can be reached on (571) 272-1156. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Scott Bushey Primary Examiner Art Unit 1724

csb 4-28-04

4-28-04